

Remarks

The paragraph numbers hereafter match Office Action paragraph numbers that they are associated with.

1. Applicant has amended the claims to deal with the claim objections.

2-3. With respect to claims 37 and 38, those claims have been cancelled in this application.

4-5. The Office Action rejected each of claims 1-4, 9, 11, 22, 29, 30, 49, 68, 69, 71, 88-91 and 101 as anticipated by Schaper. Applicant submits herewith an affidavit by one of the inventors in the present application in which the inventor, Peter Hildebrandt, swears behind Schaper with respect to claims 1-4, 9, 22, 29, 30, 49, 68, 69, 71, 88-91 and 101 and therefore Schaper cannot be used to reject those claims. This leaves only rejected claim 11 which Applicant has cancelled above.

For this reason Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the current rejection of claims 1-4, 9, 22, 29, 30, 49, 68, 69, 71, 88-91 and 101.

6-7. The Office Action rejected each of claims 5, 10, 12, 21, 31, 37-43, 50-52, 70, 85, 86, 87, 92, 95 and 102 as obvious over Schaper. In the Affidavit herewith inventor Peter Hildebrandt swears behind Schaper with respect to claims 5, 10, 21, 40, 41, 43, 50-52, 70, 92 and 95 and therefore Schaper cannot be used to reject those claims. This leaves only rejected claims 12, 31, 37, 38, 39, 42, 85-87 and 102, all of which Applicant has cancelled above.

For this reason Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the current rejection of claims 5, 10, 21, 40, 41, 43, 50-52, 70, 92 and 95.

8. The Office Action rejected each of claims 6-8, 23-28, 72, 93, 94 and 97-100 over Schaper in view of Barton. As indicated above, in the Affidavit herewith inventor Peter Hildebrandt swears behind Schaper with respect to each of claims 1, 68 and 88. Each of claims 6-8, 23-28, 72, 93, 94 and 97-100 depends either directly or indirectly from one of claims 1, 68 or 88 and therefore, for this rejection to be maintained, Barton alone has to support all of the limitations in each of claims 1, 68 and 88 which Barton clearly does not do. For this reason Applicant requests that the current rejection of claims 6-8, 23-28, 72, 93, 94 and 97-100 be withdrawn.

9. The Office Action rejected each of claims 13-16, 19, 20 and 44-48 over Schaper in view of Ayers. As indicated above, in the Affidavit herewith inventor Peter Hildebrandt swears behind Schaper with respect to claim 1. Each of claims 13-16, 19, 20 and 44-48 depends either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and therefore, for this rejection to be maintained, Ayers alone has to support all of the limitations in claim 1 which Ayers clearly does not do. For this reason Applicant requests that the current rejection of claims 13-16, 19, 20 and 44-48 be withdrawn.

10. Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing claims 61-67.

11-12. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 17, 18, 32-36, 53-60, 73-84 and 103-104 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. Applicant has foregone placing these claims in independent form at this time because the affidavit included herewith removes the primary reference as prior art and Applicant believes that the base claims are novel and non-obvious.

Applicant believes the new set of claims recite patentable subject matter and allowance of the same is requested. No fee in addition to the fees already authorized in this and accompanying documentation is believed to be required to enter this


Serial No.: 10/816,537
AMENDMENT
Page 21

amendment, however, if an additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account
No. 17-0055 in the amount of the fee.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL H. DUNN

Date: 10-27-08

By: 
Michael A. Jaskolski
Reg. No. 37,551
Attorney for Applicant
QUARLES & BRADY, LLP
411 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI. 53202-4497
(414) 277-5711